

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed August 12, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response which expires on November 12, 2004. While an extension of time is not deemed necessary, the Office is requested and hereby authorized to charge any appropriate extension-of-time fees against Deposit Account No. 04-1679 to Duane Morris, LLP.

Claims 1-6 and 10-15 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,333,544 to Turk. Dependent claims 7 and 8 stand rejected as allegedly obvious over Turk in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,873,861 to Halm. Finally, dependent claim 9 stands rejected as allegedly obvious over Turk in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,668 to Berger.

In view of the amendments made herein, the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites "*a bearing seat for receiving a roller bearing at the second shaft end is integrated in an interior wall of the chamber.*" (Emphasis added.) Turk, Halm and Berger fail to disclose or suggest at least this recitation.

Turk is directed to a motor construction for a water pump. In the embodiment of Fig. 1, Turk shows a pump motor having a bearing at only one end of the shaft and closed at the opposite end. Turk also shows motor 1 having a two-part housing 2 and 3. A centrifugal pump 5 is concentrically disposed within housing part 2 communicating with motor 4. The rotor shaft 37 of the motor passes through pumping chamber 41 of the centrifugal pump 5 and supports impeller 13. The other end of the rotor shaft 37 ends at rotor 36. Clearly, Turk does not disclose nor suggest "*a bearing seat for receiving a roller bearing at the second shaft end is integrated in interior wall of the chamber*" as claimed.

The embodiment shown in Fig. 3 of Turk also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed recitation. Fig. 3 shows motor 62 clamped directly to housing 63 of pump 61

through clamping ring 34. See col. 3, lines 30-34. The ends of rotor shaft 81 extend to pump 61 and sleeve 82. As shown, the rotor shaft 81 fails to *end in a roller bearing integrated in an interior wall of the chamber* as claimed.

The secondary reference to Halm is directed to a squirrel-cage electric motor. Referring to Fig. 1, Halm shows a motor having an end plate 1 on the side opposite a pump (the pump is not shown). End plate 1 couples to housing member 21. End plate 1 also receives motor shaft 6 through sleeve bearing 5 and sintered ring 7. At the other end, motor shaft 6 extends through bearing 17 which is supported by flange 16. Flange 16 is surrounded by casing 20 and cover 24. Thus, the rotor of Halm comprises two carbon sleeve bearings which are integrated in bearing flanges; the flanges are not integrated with a stator chamber (housing member 21) as recited in claim 1. Halm, taken individually or in combination with Turk, fails to disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 1.

The secondary reference to Berger alleges an electric motor in which end plates of the rotor and the rotor shaft are injection molded from synthetic plastic. Referring to Fig. 5, Berger shows a rotor having metal pack 11, end plates 13, rotor shaft 17 and shaft end 171. With reference to Fig. 5, the reference discloses “a bearing pin 18 or 19 is injection molded from steel for each shaft end 171, 172 as an insert which is in alignment with the shaft end 171 or 172.” Col. 3, lines 65-67. Berger does not disclose nor suggest “the stator embedded in a plastic body and the plastic body forming a chamber together with the stator” let alone a bearing seat for receiving a roller bearing integrated in an interior wall of the chamber. Berger, taken individually or in combination with Turk, fails to disclose or suggest the invention recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 7-15 depend from claim 1. Each of the dependent claims are deemed patentable by the virtue of its dependence from an otherwise patentable claim 1. Accordingly, additional reasons for patentability of the dependent claims will not be proffered here.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 1, as amended herein, are allowable over the art of record and respectfully solicit a notice to this effect.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each and every issue raised in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersign to address any issue that is deemed best resolved by a teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,



| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Mark C. Comtois | Reg. No. 46,285 |
| L. Lawton Rogers, III | Reg. No. 24,302 |
| D. Joseph English | Reg. No. 42,514 |
| Patrick D. McPherson | Reg. No. 46,255 |

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: October 14, 2004